

### **REMARKS**

Applicants have carefully reviewed the Office Action mailed on June 8, 2010 and the Advisory Action mailed August 30, 2010. Applicants respectfully traverse (and do not concede) all objections, rejections, adverse statements, and adverse assertions made by the Examiner. With this amendment and request for continued examination, claims 40, 49, and 50 are amended. No new matter is added. Please cancel claim 45 without prejudice. Claims 40-44, 46-47, 49, and 50 are presented for examination.

#### **Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103**

Claims 40-47, 49, and 50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Letendre et al. in U.S. Patent No. 6,214,036 in view of Krivoruchko et al. in U.S. Patent Application Pub. No. US 2003/0204237. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claim 45 is now canceled rendering the rejection thereof moot.

Regarding claims 40-44 and 46-47, the Advisory Action indicated that “because the claims recites a bumper ‘including’ a bumper retainer ... a portion of the bumper (one of the outwardly projecting portions) may be fairly considered to comprise the bumper retainer.”. We respectfully disagree. However, in the interest of furthering prosecution, claim 40 is amended to include the subject matter of claim 45 therein. Claim 40 now recites that the bumper retainer includes a projection formed on the bumper. This amendment more clearly distinguishes the claimed invention from Letendre et al., which only appears to teach or suggest grooves 54 at the end of apparatus 40 and not a bumper including a bumper retainer where the bumper retainer includes a projection formed on the bumper. Based on this amendment, Applicants respectfully submit that Letendre et al. does not teach or suggest all the limitations of amended claim 1. Krivoruchko et al. does not appear to overcome the shortcomings of the cited art. Consequently, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 40 is patentable over the combination of Letendre et al. and Krivoruchko et al., to the extent that such a combination is even possible. Because claims 41-44 and 46-47 depend from claim 40, they are also patentable for the same reasons as claim 40 and because they add significant elements to distinguish them further from the art.

Regarding claim 49, this claim is amended to recite that the bumper includes a retainer projecting from an outer surface of the bumper. For reasons similar to those set forth above in relation to claim 40, Applicants respectfully submit that this amendment distinguishes claim 49 from the cited art.

Regarding claim 50, this claim is amended to recite that the bumper includes means for retaining the stent projecting radially outward from the bumper. For reasons similar to those set forth above in relation to claims 40 and 49, Applicants respectfully submit that this amendment distinguishes claim 50 from the cited art.

### **Conclusion**

Further examination and withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested. It is respectfully submitted that all pending claims are now in condition for allowance. Issuance of a Notice of Allowance in due course is also respectfully requested. If a telephone conference might be of assistance, please contact the undersigned attorney at (612) 677-9050.

Respectfully submitted,

RICHARD C. GUNDERSON et al.

By their Attorney,

Date: 10/7/2010

  
J. Scot Wickhem, Reg. No. 41,376  
CROMPTON, SEAGER & TUFTE, LLC  
1221 Nicollet Avenue, Suite 800  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55403-2420  
Telephone: (612) 677-9050  
Facsimile: (612) 359-9349